

FILED & ENTERED

NOV 13 2017

CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
Central District of California
BY bakchell DEPUTY CLERK

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES DIVISION**

In re:

GRAND VIEW FINANCIAL LLC,

Debtor.

Case No. 2:17-bk-20125-RK

Chapter 11

**MEMORANDUM DECISION ON MOTION OF
GEORGE GREGORY GAN AND DEBRA
GAN-MILLER FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY**

Date: November 7, 2017

Time: 11:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 1675

This bankruptcy case came on for hearing on November 7, 2017 before the undersigned United States Bankruptcy Judge on the motion of George Gregory Gan and Debra Gan-Miller for relief from the automatic stay. Ori Blumenfeld, of the Law Offices of Michael Jay Berger, appeared for movants. Todd M. Arnold, of the law firm of Levene, Neale, Bender, Yoo & Brill, LLP, appeared for Debtor Grand View Financial, LLC, in opposition to the motion. No other appearances were made.

Having considered the moving and opposing papers and the oral and written arguments of the parties, the court grants the motion for the reasons stated on the record and as stated in its tentative ruling on the motion, which was issued before the

1 hearing and posted on the court's website, as modified by the court during its oral ruling
2 at the hearing. (The court now places the original tentative ruling for the motion on the
3 case docket as part of this memorandum decision as set forth below in an attachment).
4 The court notes that as stated on the record at the hearing, the court adopted the
5 tentative ruling as its order, but was modifying the tentative ruling for its final ruling to
6 make it clear that the court is not making a ruling at this time on abstention of hearing
7 the issues in dispute between movants and debtor and its managing member, Steve
8 Rogers, now being litigated in state court for which stay relief is sought, that is, the
9 ruling is for stay relief only.

10 The court is entering a separate final order granting the motion concurrently
11 herewith based on this memorandum decision.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 ###

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 Date: November 13, 2017



Robert Kwan
United States Bankruptcy Judge

ATTACHMENT TO MEMORANDUM DECISION

TENTATIVE RULING

Revised tentative ruling as of 11/6/17. Although it is the normal practice of this court not to issue a tentative ruling for a matter heard on shortened notice, the matter has been fully briefed by movants and respondent debtor, and the court has some preliminary thoughts on the matter.

Grant movant relief from stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1) to pursue non-bankruptcy remedies based on the analysis of the factors set forth in *In re Tucson Estates, Inc.*, 912 F.2d 1162, 1166-1167 (9th Cir. 1990) (citation omitted) regarding permissive abstention and related stay relief: (1) the effect or lack thereof on the efficient administration of the estate if the court recommends abstention - abstention would have relatively minimal effect on the effective administration of the estate since this matter involves only 1 of 42 properties listed by debtor as property of the estate - this factor favors abstention and stay relief; (2) whether state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues - it appears that they do since the issues relate to the competency of the decedent trustor who created and transferred the subject property to the trust which in turn transferred the property to debtor - this factor favors abstention and stay relief; (3) the difficulty or unsettled nature of applicable law - the issues relating to competency of decedent trust involve intensely factual determinations under state law regarding mental competency of the trustor - this factor favors abstention and stay relief; (4) the presence of a related proceeding commenced in state court - this factor favors abstention and related stay relief; (5) the jurisdictional basis, if any, other than 28 U.S.C. 1334 - the primary issue is whether the subject property is an asset of the bankruptcy estate, which will be resolved under state law, which is subject to this court's "related to" jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1334, but could be decided in a core proceeding for declaratory relief whether the asset is property of the estate - this factor is neutral; (6) degree of relatedness or remoteness to the proceeding to the main bankruptcy case- the state court action to determine the subject property is not property of the estate is somewhat related to the main bankruptcy case - this factor disfavors abstention and stay relief; (7) the substance rather than form of an asserted core proceeding - a proceeding to determine whether the subject property is property of the bankruptcy estate or not relates to administration of the bankruptcy estate, a core proceeding - this factor disfavors abstention and stay relief; (8) the feasibility of severing state law claims from core bankruptcy matters to allow judgments to be entered in state court with enforcement left to the bankruptcy court - it seems feasible to sever and allow the state court to determine the issue of trustor's competence which may well have an impact on the validity of the transfer to debtor - this factor favors abstention and stay relief; (9) the burden of the bankruptcy court's docket - it would be burdensome for the bankruptcy court to decide the issue of trustor's competency needed to determine the validity of the transfer to debtor - this factor favors abstention and stay relief; (10) likelihood that commencement of the proceeding in bankruptcy court involves forum shopping - not present here - this factor disfavors abstention and stay relief; (11) existence of a right to jury trial - not present here - this factor disfavors abstention and stay relief; (12) presence in the proceeding of nondebtor parties - this factor favors abstention.

1 The court does not rely on the so-called Curtis factors relied upon in *In re Plumberex*
2 *Specialty Products, Inc.*, 311 B.R. 551 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004) because the Tucson
3 Estates factors of the Ninth Circuit are controlling authority in this situation. Therefore,
the court rejects debtor's arguments based on the Curtis factors.

4 The court rejects debtor's argument that granting stay relief would be issuing an
5 advisory opinion in that there is no live controversy with respect to debtor. The court's
6 role in deciding a stay relief motion is to determine whether a creditor should be
7 released from the stay in order to argue the merits in a separate proceeding, and in that
8 regard, the party seeking stay relief need only establish that it has a colorable claim to
9 the property at issue. *In re Griffin*, 719 F.3d 1126, 1128 (9th Cir. 2013) (citations
10 omitted). There is a live controversy here in that movants dispute that the transfer to
11 debtor was valid and seek a determination of the validity of the transfer in state court
12 and named debtor's managing member as a respondent in that action. Technically
speaking, debtor is right that it is not a named respondent in the state court action, but
13 this seems to the court to be a matter of defective pleading by movants since the
14 transfer was to debtor, not its managing member. Since debtor is a separate legal
15 entity as a LLC, it should have been named as the respondent rather than the managing
16 member. The court would grant relief from stay to allow movants to correct this
17 deficiency by amending their pleadings in state court.

18 The court determines that the primary issue of whether the transfer of the subject
19 property to debtor was validity is dependent on a factual determination of the
20 competency of the decedent trustor, which is a matter of state law which the probate
21 court is in a much better position to decide than this court since the events relating to
22 the transfer and the witnesses are located in the county where the state court sits and
23 the issue is integral to the pending state court probate proceedings, which issue
24 probably falls within the probate exception to federal court jurisdiction relating to
25 probating or annulling a will, administering a decedent's estate and/or assuming in rem
26 jurisdiction over property that is in the custody of the probate court. See *Marshall v.*
27 *Marshall*, 547 U.S. 293, 311-312 (2006); see also, *Three Keys Ltd. v. SR Utility Holding*
28 *Co.*, 540 F.3d 220, 227(3rd Cir. 2008). In looking at the various Tucson Estates factors,
the court believes that the factual determination of the trustor's competency and
capacity to transfer the subject property may be, and should be, decided by the state
court.

29 Deny movants' requests for extraordinary relief in paragraphs 6 and 7 for lack of legal
30 authority and/or evidentiary support. *In re Van Ness*, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal.
31 2009).

32 Appearances are required on 11/7/17, but counsel may appear by telephone.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

END OF TENTATIVE RULING